

20. A method according to claim 1, wherein the substrate has an electrode line, and the electrode line and the slice line are formed by an electrode layer.

ab 21. A method according to claim 1, further comprising arranging a position of a stage based on an electrical signal representing a detected cutting position of the substrate, thereby correcting the cutting position.

22. A method according to claim 7, wherein the slice line and the guide line are formed in parallel.--.

REMARKS

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 18, 1997 does not comply with the rules. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the copy of the published European Patent Application No. 0 660 421 submitted with that Information Disclosure Statement was

incomplete. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants submit herewith, a complete copy of that document. Applicants also submit herewith a copy of the PTO-1449 form, which accompanied that Information Disclosure Statement. Applicants request that the Examiner initial and return a copy of that form, indicating that the above-noted document has been considered.

To place the subject application in better form, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities, including those noted by the Examiner. Also, a new Abstract is presented in accordance with preferred practice. Further, by separate paper, Applicants request approval to amend Figures 3 through 5. No new matter has been added by these changes.

Applicants note that the Examiner has made final the restriction requirement previously set forth. Claims 14 through 18, among others, have been withdrawn from consideration. These claims has been retained in this application in order to preserve Applicants' rights. Applicants request that the Examiner contact their undersigned representative should it be necessary to cancel those claims in order to advance the subject application to issue.

Claims 1 through 22 are presented for consideration. Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 14 and 18 are independent.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action and solely to advance prosecution, Claims 1 through 13 have been amended to clarify features of the subject invention, while Claims 19 through 22 have been added to recite additional features of the subject invention. Support for these changes can be found in the original disclosure, as filed.

Applicants note with appreciation that Claims 4 and 7 through 9 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the features of their respective base and intervening claims. To expedite prosecution, independent Claims 4 and 7 have been substantially so rewritten. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent Claims 4 and 7, as well as Claims 8, 9 and 22 depending from Claim 7, should be deemed allowable at the outset. In addition to those claims being allowable, Applicants submit that Claims 1 through 3, 5, 6, 10 through 13 and 19 through 21 patentably define features of the subject invention.

Applicants request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action.

Claims 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Examiner asserted that the original specification and drawings do not support these claims. This contention is respectfully traversed inasmuch as Claims 3 and 9 are supported by the original disclosure. For example, the first embodiment of the subject disclosure explains that a slice line 101 and a guide line 102 are provided on a substrate, and that the slice line and the guide line are formed by an electrode layer simultaneously and in parallel with a first or a second electrode constituting a TFT or a sensor, or by the first or second electrode. Claim 3 defines that the guide line and the slice line are simultaneously formed, respectively. This is supported as noted above. Claim 9 defines that the guide line, the slice line and the electrode line are simultaneously formed. Since it is clear that the electrode layer can be the electrode line, Applicants further submit that Claim 9 is supported by the original disclosure. For these reasons, Applicants request favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 through 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to particular phraseology in several of these

claims. To expedite prosecution, Claims 1 through 13 have been amended in light of the Examiner's comments. Applicants submit that these changes overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Such favorable indication is requested.

Turning now to the art rejection, Claims 1, 3, 6 and 10 through 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,611,517 to Schmale. Applicants submit that this patent does not teach many features of the present invention, as previously recited in Claims 1, 3, 6 and 10 through 12. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Schmale patent discloses that in cutting a fabric, a slider is moved along a loopless or napless zone to cut the fabric. Applicants submit, however, that this patent does not teach or suggest the salient features of Applicants' present invention, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Specifically, this patent is not read to teach or suggest cutting a substrate having a slice line provided on the substrate and a guide line provided, which corresponds to the slice line and is different from the slice line and detecting a position of the guide line and correcting a cutting position while the substrate is cut along the slice line, as recited in independent Claim 1. Likewise, that patent does not teach or suggest cutting a

substrate, provided with a slice line and a guide line, along the slice line, detecting the guide line during the cutting to detect deviation with respect to the guide line and correcting a cutting position based on the detected deviation, as recited in independent Claim 11. Therefore, the Schmale patent does not teach many features of the present invention, as recited in these independent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present invention, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 11, also is patentably defined over the cited art.

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 19 through 21 also should be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Further individual consideration of these dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,326

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SEW:rle